

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

JOSEPH GUGLIELMO,	:	Case No. 3:17-cv-6
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Thomas M. Rose
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO, and	:	
the MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF	:	
COMMISSIONERS, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

---

**ENTRY AND ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS ON APPEAL (DOC.  
124) AND AFFIRMING THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S DECISION (DOC. 96)**

---

This case is before the Court on Defendants' Appeal (Doc. 124) of Magistrate Judge Ovington's June 1, 2018 Decision (Doc. 96) pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72. Magistrate Judge Ovington's Decision denied Defendants' Motion to Extend Deposition Deadline (Doc. 62), granted Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order (Doc. 79), and ordered Defendants, as a sanction, to pay Plaintiff's reasonable fees and expenses caused by Defendants' Motion to Extend Deposition Deadline. Defendants object to all three of the above dispositions in the Magistrate Judge's Decision. Plaintiff's filed a Response (Doc. 132) in opposition to the Defendants' Appeal. This matter is ripe for review.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a), the Court has reviewed the parties' memoranda for and against the Motion to Extend Deposition Deadline (Docs. 62, 77, 83, 90), the parties' memoranda for and against the Motion for Protective Order (Docs. 79, 88, 92), the Magistrate Judge's Decision (Doc. 96), Defendants' Appeal (Doc. 124), Plaintiff's

Response (Doc. 132), and the record as a whole. Upon said review, the Court finds that no part of the Magistrate Judge's Decision is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Consequently, Defendants' objections are **OVERRULED** and the Decision is **AFFIRMED**.

**DONE** and **ORDERED** in Dayton, Ohio, this Monday, January 28, 2019.

s/Thomas M. Rose

---

THOMAS M. ROSE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE